DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 151 629 CG 012 207

AUTHOR Myrow, David L.
TITLE Three Approaches to Teacher Self Development.
PUB DATE [77]
NOTE 21p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Helping Relationship; Human Development; Individual Development; *Peer Counseling; *Personality Development; *Preservice Education; Program Descriptions; *Self Actualization; *Teacher Education; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS *Transactional Analysis

ABSTRACT

This paper describes training innovations currently taking place in a pre-service teacher education program. The experiences are designed systematically to facilitate self-development. They include (1) learning about human development through autobiographical reflection; (2) applying Transactional Analysis to peer and professional relationships; and (3) improving helping skills via peer-counseling experiences. Student self-report and course evaluation data from four semesters are offered. This evidence shows that preservice teachers find these personal development experiences useful for increasing their self-understanding and their professional effectiveness. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
D L. Myrow
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Three Approaches to Teacher Self Development

David L. Myrow
School of Education
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13210

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED151629

As a psychologist I am continually amazed to discover how few teacher education programs include developmental psychology in their core curricula. How can teachers work without a sense of the progress of human development? Courses in Educational Psychology attempt to deal with some aspects of human behavior with decreasing emphasis on developmental psychology and greater emphasis on learning theory (Gaite, 1975; Nunney, 1964). While learning theory can help teachers organize and deliver formal instruction, it does not deal directly with interpersonal, emotional, and motivational issues. These issues - which concretely include getting along with other teachers and students,"disciplining" and "motivating"students, and finding oneself in the teaching role - concern teachers, especially beginning teachers, more than instructional issues (Fuller, 1969, 1970; Sattler, Grinder, and Clark, 1971). Psychology has a great deal to say about how people get along and the developmental experiences which set the stage for this, including those aspects of cognitive development which influence the way persons perceive the world and their relationships to it. The three approaches to teacher self-development described in this paper are concerned with helping pre-service teachers understand how people develop particular strategies for getting along with each other.

Yet there is more to this story. Teachers are always a party to their relationships with their students and colleagues. In fact, it can be argued that it is the teacher's personhood that is central to his or her interpersonal effectiveness with students and colleagues. While learning about the processes of development probably will be helpful to teachers who are attempting to facilitate their students' development, such intellectual understanding in no way ensures that teachers will integrate the theory into their interactions with students. Each teacher's personal development is a more potent determinant of his or her behavior with students and colleagues. For example, teachers' needs for affection and approval will affect their ability to set limits for children. Teachers' beliefs about women may affect their

CG012207

behavior toward little girls. Needs to appear strong may subvert attempts to empathize with students. Teachers' demands for affection can undermine students' autonomy. Feelings about their own worth and power influence teachers' relationships with supervisors and colleagues. The life experiences which lead teachers to assume these views are also important aspects of developmental psychology.

Development of self-concept, self-esteem, and beliefs about other people is carried on mostly in families, and to some extent in schools. Children are powerfully influenced by the ways their parents and peers relate to them. And, while families are more potent influences in the most plastic formative (first five) years, schools not only have the potential to serve a continuing (after 5) influence on person development, but also the potential to remediate problems not resolved in the pre-school years. As developing persons, teachers were influenced by the same factors as were the students whom they teach. Understanding their own development can permit teachers to become more empathic with their students as well as to help students in their quests for selfhood. So, although it could be fruitful to instruct teachers about theories of human development, it would be more academic than fruitful if teachers' awareness of their own courses of development were not part of the formula. So the three approaches I am about to describe all have two sides to them: a "professional and theoretical" aspect and a personal aspect. The assumption is that if teachers aren't part of the solution, they may become part of the problem.

Let me be specific for a moment about the kinds of developmental concerns that these three approaches consider. I am concerned about the possibility that untested preconceptions may prevent teachers from seeing their students realistically; or that unresolved interpersonal issues may distort their views of and expectations about their students. These same conflicts may make it difficult for teachers to enjoy being with their students. Teachers need to be able to find enough sources of satisfaction in their personal lives that they will not look to students to supply their needs. It is my view that to facilitate students' emotional development,

teachers need to be relatively secure persons who experience life fully and who can help students grow to appreciate life's meanings and ambiguities. It takes effort to become this sort of person. I believe that it is appropriate for a teacher education program to offer this point of view and to provide self-development experiences which encourage students to explore their personhood in these ways.

Although this is a value-laden position, it has been supported by research which demonstrates that teachers' effectiveness in the classroom is related to their development as persons. For example, Art Combs' (1969) research demonstrated convincingly that more effective teachers see themselves as more adequate, trustworthy and self-revealing than less effective teachers. More recently, Berliner and Tikunoff (1977) identified a number of variables that distinguished effective from ineffective teachers. Among them were things like degree of accepting students' feelings and attitudes, spontaniety, and (negatively related to effectiveness) belittling children in front of others and seeking recognition from the students. These variables are clearly related to the teachers' own needs, conflicts, and behavior patterns.

While the three approaches to teacher self-development I am about to describe differ in content and strategy, they share a common goal: to help teachers learn about the processes of human devleopment as well as to facilitate their own development as persons. In endeavoring to help students see the meaning of theory in their own lives, I hope that the students and I both go beyond our current perceptions of ourselves and others to find more effective ways of being with ourselves and our students.

Context

The approaches to teacher self-development I will be describing are part of Syracuse University's undergraduate, pre-service teacher education program. The program itself is innovative since students have practical experiences via field placements beginning in their first Education course and continuing throughout their professional education semesters. This begins with experiences in tutoring and observing children. Elementary education majors spend two days each week in schools

in their first full-time semester, three days weekly during the second, and full-time during their student teaching semester. Secondary majors follow a similar pattern, but with somewhat less time in schools. All students also take methods courses, most of which are one-credit mini courses which meet on campus for two hours weekly for seven weeks, as well as a full compliment of liberal arts courses. The workload is demanding. The pressure of being in field situations adds--helpfully, I think--to students' concerns about their potential to become good teachers and their feelings about teaching as a career. Working closely with children, experienced teachers, and peers also raises many interpersonal questions and problems.

The three minicourses I offer can be related to the kinds of interpersonal situations which occur in the field, as well as to personal issues with friends and family. Although the three workshops--"Human Development," "Helping Skills," and "Self-Realization"--are electives, scheduling problems have often reduced students' options, and some of the students took these courses more out of necessity than out of free choice.

The Minicourses

Human Development is the latest of these minicourses to be developed. It came about when it became apparent that our new program did not offer any courses dealing explicity with theory of child development. Although some students took Child or Adolescent Development in the Psychology department, few were familiar with psychological processes and issues in human development which might help them to better understand their students and themselves. Now that I think back, filling this void with a one-credit, 14-contact-hours minicourse was no small challenge! I made some value-laden decisions and concluded that an important focus to consider was nurturance, largely as provided in the family, including the kinds of interactions that occurred between parents and children and among the children and the effect of these interactions on development of self-concept and expectations about other people. I also decided

that for this to have a deep meaning for students, it had to be based on real cases of developing people, including themselves. I chose to use an inductive strategy to encourage students to generate their own "principles" of development. I found an anthology of childhood autobiographies of famous people (Milgram and Sciarra, 1974), adapted some structured interactions from Peoplemaking (Satir, 1972), and devised a series of mini-lectures on topics like what it means to be a nurturant person, the family social situation and children's feelings, modelling, the development of self-esteem, and the effects of birth order on sibling relationships and self-concept. Each course meeting provided a mini-lecture, structured interactions which invited students to consider childhood feelings in the light of their own histories, and discussion.

Here is an illustration of how the various activities worked together. In the context of family interactions, I wanted to introduce Freud's hypotheses about the Oedipus and Electra situations as paradigms for some of the conflicts that arise in families. My experience as a student and as a teacher was that if these ideas were introduced at all, they were introduced in such an intellectualized way as to seem like the ravings of a madman. (When I was an undergraduate at Illinois, one child psych teacher told us not to bother with Freud, as his work was passé). My personal search for self-understanding was quite the contrary. I thought that, when considered from the point of view of a child's feelings, the Oedipus and Electra conflicts were more believable, and were at least useful metaphors for the emotional conflicts children face. So, in the Human Development class, students first read childhood autobiobraphies of Eleanor Roosevelt and Dick Gregory, in which their Oedipal and Electral conflicts were explicitly recalled, but not intellectualized. For example, at one point in his childhood, Gregory literally attempted to murder his father when his father wandered home drunk after months of absence and beat up his mother. In between visits, Gregory's mother had invited a nearly symbiotic attachment and his father's return brought out livid jealousy and confusion in the boy. While Eleanor Roosevelt's feelings were

not acted out, her recall of childhood jealousy of her mother is equally vivid, and her plans to marry her father and have children with him are explicitly recounted. As students read these autobiographies, we did some role playing in class which was designed to invite recall of some of their feelings as children. One of the vehicles for this was a parent-child situation developed by Virginia Satir (1972). Working in pairs, one student stands while the other sits on the floor at his or her feet. They engage in conversations, take in the scenery, and reliably begin to sense what it is like to feel little among giants, what it is like to feel less adequate and a bit weaker than the "parent". These feelings play an important part in early development and can influence children's perceptions of themselves. Sometimes reality-testing does not totally correct these perceptions as people grow older. By reexamining such early feelings, college students are alerted to the conditions that invite Oedipal and Electral feelings. Instead of an exercise in labelling somewhat unbelievable developmental stages, the unit becomes a realistic characterization of one of the important life crises. At this point in the unit, I introduced Freud's formulations and invited students to compare their conceptualizations of what goes on with children with his view. I might add that, in future versions of this unit, I will add to my minilecture the recent research interpretations by Fisher and Greenberg (1977). In considering Freud's hypothesis that boys identify with their fathers to resolve their Oedipal conflicts, they provide data which shows that the identification comes not out of fear of the father, but rather from the father's nurturing invitation to give up the conflict and work together toward the boy's growth into manhood.

Since the arrangements for this workshop differed somewhat from most university courses, they are worthy of note. What would be requirements in most courses were defined as responsibilities; responsibilities which we all shared. The participants' responsibilities included reading short autobiographies (Milgram and Sciarra, 1974) and sections of Lidz's The Person (1976); becoming personally involved in outside work, which included personally reflective experiences; sharing their ideas and experiences in short, weekly papers; and evaluating their progress in the course, including

assigning their own grades. My responsibilities included identifying useful outside-of-class experiences; structuring class time; providing personal feedback on weekly papers; providing minilectures; and serving as a resource person. There were no term papers, multiple-choice tests, book reports, or final exams. Only an occasional student found it difficult to take responsibility for participation in the activities, and we wasted no time playing the grading game. Most of the participants put in more than the usual amount of time appropriate for a one-credit course, and the data that I will present later in the paper shows that most of them found it a worthwhile experience.

Helping Skills. The second approach I am describing was one of the first minicourses offered in our redesigned teacher education program (the first group was in Fall 1974), and, from the first, had a practical focus. The goals were to help students learn about and become effective at certain specific interviewing skills: to be able to paraphrase (reflect back) accurately what someone said; to improve capacity for accurate empathy; to become proficient at perceiving both verbal and nonverbal communications; and to begin to develop effective use of self-disclosure of feelings in helping situations. Working toward these goals could take up the greater share of energy in a graduate program in counselling psychology. To make matters worse, administrative rearrangement of the schedule reduced contact time in later offerings of the course from the original 24 to 14. Even in the shorter format, however, we have been able to introduce some of the basic issues in establishing helping relationships and have been able to develop some minimal proficiency in listening and responding. As will be shown in the data section students' evaluations of this course were quite positive and they seem to have applied what they learned to both personal and professional situations. 12

Workshop time was spent in describing and modelling basic skills, in practicing the skills, and in discussion of individuals' experiences in and outside of the workshop. Very little theory was introduced, primarily some of Carkhuff's (1969) ideas-to provide a sense of the course of development of helping relationships -- and aspects of Combs' (1969) work to add substance and to provide a bridge between theory and practice.

Many of the exercises used were inspired by the work of Danish and Hauer (1973) and Egan (1975). These exercises included practicing "attending" behavior, i.e., good posture, eye contact, and voice quality; accurate identification of others' expressed feelings; giving accurate reflection of content; and considering alternative responses to others' statements. Time spent on "practicing" self-disclosure to invite open-ness from others offered opportunities for sharing personal concerns. This was sometimes done in pairs to build trust more quickly. Sometimes this material moved into the group. There were many opportunities to discuss relationships with children, families, and peers. Sharing of these concerns was often appropriate to the course content, and helped students consider their styles of relating to others as well as alternative behaviors.

Self Realization. The third approach was designed as an opportunity for students to increase their self-awareness. The focus was on the students themselves: how they interacted with peers, relatives, and children, and the life experiences that predisposed them to behave in those ways. The theory that served as a medium for these explorations was primarily Berne's Transactional Analysis (cf. Berne, 1973), with additions (and improvements) from psychoanalytical psychology. Like Helping Skills, the original version of this minicourse provided about 28 hours of contact time, which was reduced in administrative reorganization a year later to 18. Consequently, an ongoing encounter group, part of the original plan, was dropped in favor of structured tasks (for pairs and groups) which were designed to encourage self-revelation and exploration more systematically than was possible in the encounter groups. So the most recent format was about evenly divided between minilectures (on TA and related theory) and structured interpersonal "encounters."

A brief overview of some of the theory presented as well as the interactive experiences employed may provide a sense of the issues open to exploration in this workshop. A major topic was strokes: how people stroke each other physically, verbally and nonverbally; the origin of stroking styles in early family interactions;

and the ways people manipulate each other to get strokes; research on the impact of kinds of stroking on development, e.g. how a lack of early emotional contact can lead to marasmus. Students worked in pairs and group discussions to explore the kinds of stroking that occurred in their families and their current needs and styles of stroking.

Berne's theory about personality development -- the role and function of the Parent, Adult, and Child ego states -- was also introduced and compared with Freud's concepts of Superego, Ego, and Id. Students practiced identifying ego states represented in various role-playing situations, paying particular attention to nonverbal ones. Work outside of class dealt with identifying ego states in interactions students observed between their peers and their own students in schools. Other aspects of Transactional Analysis that were considered included psychological games and their functions; life positions (the "I'm OK/You're OK" world views and the events that lead people to assume those positions); and, when time permitted, a brief introduction to the idea of life scripts. Interview schedules were provided to pairs of students so that they could better identify the styles of their transactions with other people and to facilitate recall of early family experiences that led them to assume views of themselves and others. From my perspective, the short amount of time available restricted the kinds of emotional involvements that lead to substantial increases in self-awareness. On the other hand, students' saw the experiences personally meaningful, perhaps in part because so few university experiences are available for this kind of self-exploration. The outside work may also have played a major part in the usefulness of the experiences. Students read Born to Win and at their discretion, worked through the Gestalt Therapy - inspired self-awareness exercises provided throughout. They also sampled from a reading list, and worked through some observation tasks, for example, categorizing the kinds of strokes given in an episode of "All in the Family." As in the other two courses, students assessed their own progress via a self-evaluation instrument provided by the instructor, and on the basis of their self-assessment, combined with ongoing feedback from the instructor and the other participants, assigned their own

grades. As in Human Development, it was made clear from the beginning that the responsibilities for getting something out of the workshop was shared with the instructor.

Students' Assessments of Their Minicourse Experiences

Since the first Helping Skills workshop was offered in Spring 1974, assessments of the participants' experiences in all three minicourses have been made periodically, primarily via a wide variety of course evaluation instruments. The data gathered in this way was used primarily to improve the courses. Although different open-ended questionnaires were employed at various times, two instruments used during the past year were administered to all three minicourses. These were the Course Evaluation Supplement and the Relationships Inventory. The results from recent administrations of these instruments will be presented since they permit comparisons between the outcomes for the three workshops. In addition, data from course evaluations for three semesters of Self Realization will be considered.

The Course Evaluation Supplement asked students to compare a given minicourse to other Education courses that they had taken at Syracuse University. (School of Education requirements ensured that participants had taken at least the Introduction to Education course; most students had taken at least two other minicourses.) The items in this survey, along with means and standard deviations, are shown in Table 1. The figures are for the Spring 1977 offerings of the workshops. (The Course Evaluation Supplement also was administered to The Helping Skills and Human Development groups in Fall 1976. Means for all of the items except no.9 were ordered identically as for the Spring 1977 sample.) There is a great deal of order to the data; a number of inferences can be made about the comparative effects of the workshops on the participants.

Consider item #1, for example, which asked students to rate the minicourse in terms of how useful it was in helping them become better teachers. The course that was

most behavioral, most technique-oriented -- Helping Skills -- was rated highest among the three groups. Human Development, which focussed on both children and adults, was rated next most useful, and Self Realization, which focussed on the participants themselves, was found least useful in helping the participants become better teachers. Item 2, which dealt with students' ratings of the usefulness of a workshop in increasing self-understanding, elicited comparable results. Self-Realization, in which the main goal was self-understanding, was rated highest. Helping Skills, which permitted the next most personally-invested interactions in class, was rated next highest, and Human Development, with a more theoretical focus, was seen as least useful for self-understanding. In terms of understanding children, responses to item #3 also reflected the different course orientations. Human Development, which, in large part, focussed on the emotional experiences of the growing child, was given the highest rating. Helping Skills, which virtually ignored the processes of development per se, was rated lowest. Self Realization, which, while focussing on the participants, presented a theory of personality formation, was seen as having a relatively moderate impact on helping the participants understand children. This contrasts with the first item, in which the behavioral approach (Helping Skills) was seen as most useful in helping students become better teachers, while Human Development was seen as having more impact in increasing their understanding of children.

Items 5, 6, and 7 represent the three factors isolated in Syracuse University's campus-wide Instructional Rating Survey (Stern and Richman, 1973), which focusses on instructors' performance. The three items were included in the Course Evaluation Supplement to compare the balance of these factors in the personally-oriented mini-courses. The fact that instructor warmth was rated virtually identically for all three workshops lends credence to the suggestions that instructor variables did not account for the differences in outcomes between the minicourses. The ratings of class discussions correlate highly with the amount of time students spent in interaction in the workshops. Perhaps three-quarters of the workshop time in Helping Skills was devoted to practice

of specific skills or group discussion. In Self Realization, about half of the time was spent on dyadic and small-group encounters, and in Human Development, perhaps one-third of the contact time was devoted to discussions. It is somewhat embarrassing to report to this august body (it might be somewhat less embarrassing in September) that, of the three factors represented in items 5, 6, and 7, "intellectual challenge" was uniformly rated lower than "instructor warmth" and "class discussions." It is even more embarrassing for this psychoanalytically-oriented psychologist to report that, of the three minicourses, the behavioral one ---Helping Skills ---was seen as most intellectually challenging. I feel confident that this was due to the fact that, since the behavioral approach offered the least in the way of explaining behavior, it seemed the most puzzling to students, and therefore was seen as intellectually stimulating. As to the overall relatively low ratings given intellectual challenge for these minicourses, the best I can say is that it makes sense! A relatively large amount of time was spent in these workshops on interactive experiences; relative to most university courses, less time was spent on learning theoretical material. In a way, it shows a weakness of the minicourses, since person development is an intellectually sound and challenging field of study. On the other hand, compared to most university courses, these workshops have a much clearer focus on personal development for the students, and the less intellectualizing about this, the better. At any rate, in future versions of these minicourses, I hope to introduce more theory, hopefully without sacrificing the personal orientation.

A few additional remarks about the data in Table 1 are in order. At first glance, it seems surprising that personal feedback from the instructor (item 8) was rated lowest for the most personally oriented workshop (Self Realization) and highest in the most theory oriented workshop (Human Development). There are good reasons for this seeming paradox. In the Human Development workshop, students wrote a short paper each week on both theoretical and personal issues. The instructor responded to each paper with individual comments. Students in Helping Skills submitted three or four written

exercises during the course and those in the most recent offerings of Self Realization only submitted two or three such papers. Thus, the ratings correlated positively with the amount of feedback provided. In early versions of Self Realization, students responded in writing to many of the exercises in Born to Win and the instructor provided personal feedback. Also, in the earlier versions of this minicourse, the greater (nearly double) amount of contact time permitted "here-and now" feedback via the encounter group work. Both of these avenues for sharing provided more interaction with the instructor. Since early course evaluations indicated that these approaches were useful for many students, I will again include them when future versions of the minicourse have longer formats.

One of the anticipated outcomes of personal development groups was that they would affect the ways the participants relate to other people. In the best of all possible worlds, this could be assessed by objective observation of the participants in home and field settings. Since the city of Syracuse, N. Y., is only second best as possible worlds go, we gathered some self-report data, which at worst must be taken with a grain of salt and at best must be seen as phenomenological data. The Relationships Inventory used for this purpose contained three items, each with a rating scale and room for an open-ended reply. The three items, with means and standard deviations for the Spring 1977 groups, are shown in Table 2. (Please note that the scales for this inventory were weighted oppositely to those in the Course Evaluation Supplement.) Throughout the groups, the relationships that students saw as most affected by the minicourses were those with friends. Between the minicourse groups, the most positive effects on relationships with friends were reported by students in Helping Skills. Among the outcomes these students cited in response to this question were: listening more and giving less advice; being less negative and more open; identifying friends' feelings more often and more accurately; better eye contact in conversations; and more openness in expressing feelings. In contrast, participants in Human Development reported that their dealings with friends were affected in these

ways: better understanding of friends' behavior and its meanings; clearer perceptions of friends' personalities; increased awareness of how friends affected the participants' behavior and the feelings they had about their friends; and more honest communications with friends. Participants in the Self Realization group identified the following outcomes regarding their relationships with friends: more open communications; clearer perceptions of how people see themselves; and better understanding of people's motivations, both their own and others'. Between the three groups, there are some similarities and some differences in outcomes concerning relationships with friends. The points of departure seem to reflect the variations in approach between the minicourses. For example, participants in Helping Skills more often identified changes in terms of their behavior; students in Human Development reported better understanding of personalities and perceptiveness in the exchange of feelings; and those in Self Realization noted increased awareness of others' perceptions and of underlying factors in behavior.

Although participants rated the impact of the workshops on their relationships with their families lower than the impact on relationships with friends and children, they cited a variety of outcomes--a variety which, again, reflected the orientations of the workshops. Students in Human Development reported these changes: better understanding of and improved relationships with brothers and sisters; increased understanding of their families' influence on their own development; increased ability to see family members as individuals; and better understanding of parents' communication and feelings. One married student reported better relationships with her daughter. Several students said that they had not been in touch with their families since the course began. A few others reported that, as one student put it, "After 2[illegible] years of a certain style, things don't change much." Students in Self Realization reported relatively fewer ways that the course affected relationships with their families. Those cited included better understanding of parents' behavior; more open communications; and improved ability to make needs and views known. One thing to keep in mind with the Self Realization group is that, insofar as the experiences affected self-awareness, it

is likely that, at a given time, some of the students may have been re-experiencing negative feelings toward their families as well as positive. This is because, in the process of recalling early family situations, people were likely to recall painful memories as well as pleasurable ones. The students could use both kinds of recall to help understand their perceptions of themselves, others, and their options in dealing with other people.

Like their reports of changes in relationships with friends, students in Helping Skills tended to report outcomes regarding their families in behavioral terms. Changes noted included listening more accurately to parents; more clearly perceiving parents' feelings; and increased awareness of when (one student) was "tuning out" his parents.

Considering that one of the long-range goals of these three personal development experiences was to help young teachers improve their relationships with their students, it was gratifying to find that participants found the courses to have a fairly strong, positive impact on these relationships. Students in Helping Skills gave the highest ratings in this regard and also provided many case examples. Outcomes they cited included: greater awareness of children's wants and needs; increased ability to communicate caring and concern to their students; better communicating (as students) with their supervising teachers; more openness in sharing feelings with kids and a corresponding increase in their students' openness; and being more attuned to children's feelings. The students in Human Development reported relatively fewer examples of the course's effects on relationships with children. Those that were reported were more family-oriented: more concern for children's home situations and their impact on children; increased awareness of the subtler influences families have on development (e.g., on self-concept and self-esteem); decreased judgmental behavior toward children; more empathy for kids' feelings; and more awareness of the impact of children's feelings on their behavior. One or two students reported situations in which, due to their course experiences, they intervened in children's behalves, i.e., in finding a resource for the child at the school. Among the outcomes reported by students in

Self Realization were better understanding of how to communicate with kids; ability to use a greater variety of approaches in dealing with children, for example in ways of setting limits; giving more positive strokes; and having a better understanding of how kids develop and how to improve the conditions for their continued development.

In general, the college students reported that these minicourses had a wide variety of effects on their relationships with friends, families, and children. The outcomes reflected the orientations of the particular workshops. In a way it is surprising that any effects were reported. We do not usually measure the impact of university courses in terms of their effects on relationships! Yet these three minicourses, even with a relatively limited number of contact hours, seem to have had at least some influence---for the better, in the students' value systems---on the participants' lives outside the classroom.

Since the student ratings discussed so far were based on workshops occuring in one semester, it is reasonable to ask about the reliability of these kinds of outcomes. Data on Self Realization taken from course evaluations in previous semesters may be helpful in this regard. Table 3 summarizes student responses to three questions which were asked on anonymous course evaluations in Fall 1975, Spring 1976, and Fall 1976 workshops. While these questions are more general than the ones asked on the more recently-devised instruments, they suggest some stability in the overall impact of the minicourse over three terms. The only question which drew a varying pattern was the one concerning students' abilities to relate the workshop experiences to professional concerns. As the previously reported data showed, the Self Realization workshop, with a focus on the college students themselves, appeared to be less professionally oriented.

With the emphasis on self-development in this minicourse, it is instructive to look at the kinds of professionally-related outcomes the students reported from their Self Realization experiences in the three earlier workshops. These included: under-

standing what led to the choice of a teaching career; realizing that the participant had been carefully guarding feelings when with students; trying less often to win students' affection; having greater confidence in dealing with kids; being more aware of being condescending or controlling with kids; having increased awareness of how children trigger certain emotions; realizing how older teachers act parental in giving advice; and understanding children better.

Looking back on the development of these approaches and students' reactions to their minicourse experiences, I feel pleased about the way things have gone. Even Helping Skills and Human Development, which included the students' own development as only one of several goals, seem to have engaged the students in self-exploration and self-examination. The student self-report data available suggests that the exploration had positive effects, both intrapersonally and interpersonally. The experiences in these minicourses support the notions that situations can be designed which encourage teachers' self-development, and that as teachers advance their own personhood, their students can also benefit.

References

Berliner D. C. and Tikunoff, W. J. The California beginning teacher evaluation study: overview of the ethnographic study. Journal of Teacher Education, 27, 1976, 24-30.

Berne, E. What do you say after you say hello? N.Y.: Bantam Books, 1973.

Carkhuff, R. R. Helping and human relations, Vol II. N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1969.

Combs, A. W. Florida studies in the helping professions. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1969.

Danish, S. J. and Hauer, A. L. Helping Skills: a basic training program. Morningside Heights, N.Y.: Behavioral Publications, 1973.

Egan, G. The skilled helper: a model for systematic helping and interpersonal relating. Monterey, CA.: Brooks/Cole, 1975.

Fisher, S. and Greenberg, R. P. The Scientific Credibility of Freund's Theory and Therapy. N.Y.: Basic Books, 1977.

Fuller, F. F. Concerns of teachers: a developmental conceptualization. American Educational Research Journal, 1969, 6, 207-226.

Fuller, F. F. Personalized education for teachers. University of Texas at Austin, July 1970. (U.S. Office of Education Contract OE 6-10-108).

Gaite, A. J. H. Approaches to educational psychology--some recent textbooks. Educational Psychologist, 1975, 11, 197-204.

Lidz, T. The Person (revised ed.) N.Y.: Basic Books, 1976.

Milgram, J. I. and Sciarra, D. J. Childhood Revisited. N.Y.: Macmillan, 1974.

Nunney, D. N. Trends in the content of Educational Psychology, 1948-63. Journal of Teacher Education, 1964, 15. 372-377.

Satir, V. Peoplemaking. Palo Alto, CA.: Science and Behavior Books, 1972.

Sattler, H. E., Grinder, R. E., and Clark, M. C. In D.C. Charles (ed.), Symposium: Psychology in teacher education today. Journal of Teacher Education, 22, 4, 1971, 391-417.

Stern, G. and Richman, J. Instructional rating survey. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University, 1973.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of Student Ratings of Items on the Course Evaluation Supplement (Spring 1977 Groups)

Item		Minicourse Group: Human Devel. N=25/27[a]	Helping Skills N=13/15	Self Realiz. N=11/14
1. usefulness in helping you become a better teacher	M	2.00[b]	1.75	2.27
	s	.95	.92	.65
2. usefulness in helping you gain self-understanding	M	1.77	1.33	1.18
	s	.79	.47	.41
3. usefulness in helping you understand children	M	1.68	2.16	2.00
	s	.69	.68	.63
4. usefulness in helping you understand adults	M	1.90	1.66	2.00
	s	.79	.62	.89
5. intellectual challenge provided by the course[c]	M	2.19	2.08	2.55
	s	1.09	.75	.69
6. instructor's warmth[c]	M	1.45	1.41	1.46
	s	.78	.64	.69
7. rating of class discussions[c]	M	1.90	1.50	1.73
	s	.79	.50	.79
8. personal feedback provided by the instructor	M	1.31	1.58	2.09
	s	.55	.75	.94
9. overall rating of the instructor	M	1.27	1.41	1.64
	s	.53	.49	.81
10. overall rating of the course	M	1.86	1.66	1.36
	s	1.05	.47	.67

[a] N=25/27 means that, of 27 students enrolled in the course, 25 filled out the evaluation.

[b] Ratings were made on a five-point scale, with 1.00="Exceptional/Outstanding", 3.00="Average", and 5.00="Unsatisfactory".

[c] Items representing three main factors on Syracuse University's "Instructional Rating Survey" (Stern and Richman, 1973)

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Student Ratings of Items on the Relationships Inventory (Spring 1977 Groups)

Item		Minicourse Group: Human Devel. N=24/27[a]	Helping Skills N=14/15	Self Realiz. N=10/14
1. How has what you learned in this minicourse affected the ways you relate to friends?	M	4.17[b]	4.82	4.20
	s	.64	.37	.63
2. How has what you learned in this minicourse affected the ways you relate to your family?	M	3.96	3.89	3.70
	s	.74	.63	.68
3. How has what you learned in this minicourse affected the ways you relate to your students or to children generally?	M	4.17	4.48	3.90
	s	.80	.63	.88

[a] N=24/27 means that, of 27 students enrolled in the course, 24 filled out the evaluation.

[b] Items were rated on a five-point scale, where 5.00="very positively", 3.00="not at all", and 1.00="very negatively".

Table 3

Summaries of Student Responses to Questions About the Self Realization Minicourse for Three Semesters

Question		Semester: Fall 1975 N=24/25[ab]	Spring 1976 N=21/28[b]	Fall 1976 N=10/13
1. Would you recommend this minicourse to a friend?	Yes	18	21	10
	No	0	0	0
	Other	2	0	0
2. Have you been able to relate what you've learned to your professional concerns?	Yes	12	14	9
	No	0	2	0
	Other	8	5	1
3. Has this course been personally meaningful for you?	Yes	18	20	9
	No	0	0	1
	Other	2	1	0

[a] N=24/25 means that, of 25 students enrolled, 24 filled out the course evaluation.

[b] Data summarized for two different groups meeting on separate days.